

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17, 19, 20, and 22 are pending in this case.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Mackintosh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,784, hereinafter “Mackintosh”) in view of Song et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030211843, hereinafter “Song”). Claim 4 was indicated as including allowable subject matter.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that Claim 4 includes allowable subject matter.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Mackintosh in view of Song, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 13 recite in part:

assigning a service session ID to the broadcast receiver
and a valid period for the service session ID, said service
session ID assigned at each acquisition request to identify a
current communication connection;
performing an authentication process on the acquisition
request based on the session ID ***and the valid period, said
authentication process failing when the valid period is
expired.***

The outstanding Office Action conceded that Mackintosh does not teach or suggest assigning a service session ID and cited Song as describing this feature.¹ In particular, page 2 of the outstanding Office Action cites step 100 of Song as describing “performing authentication process” and the timeout described in step 124 of Song, shown in Figure 4 and described at paragraph 47 of Song, as describing “said authentication process failing when the valid period is expired.” However, it is respectfully noted that the authentication process

¹See the outstanding Office Action at page 5.

is finished after the completion of step 100 of Song. Specifically, paragraph 38 of Song describes that if authentication is passed the described process continues to step 102, which occurs before step 124. Thus, by the time the process of Song reaches step 124, the authentication process has already been passed, or step 102 would never have been reached. Accordingly, the timeout described in paragraph 47 as part of step 124 cannot be part of the authentication process. Further, such a timeout cannot be considered failing the authentication process, as such a user as clearly already passed the authentication process, whether or not a broadcast timeout subsequently occurs. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Song does not teach or suggest “performing an authentication process on the acquisition request based on the session ID and the valid period, *said authentication process failing when the valid period is expired*” as defined in Claims 1 and 13. Consequently, Claims 1 and 13 (and Claims 2-6, 14-17, 19, 20, and 22 dependent therefrom) are patentable over Mackintosh in view of Song.

Claim 8 recites in part “an authentication unit configured to performing an authentication process on the acquisition request based on the session ID and the valid period and provide an indication that the authentication process was successful or unsuccessful, *said authentication unit indicating that the authentication process was unsuccessful when the valid period is expired.*”

As noted above with respect to Claims 1 and 13, the timeout described in paragraph 47 of Song as part of step 124 cannot be part of the authentication process. Further, such a timeout cannot be considered failing the authentication process, as such a user as clearly already passed the authentication process, whether or not a broadcast timeout subsequently occurs. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Song does not teach or suggest “an authentication unit” as defined in Claim 8. Consequently, Claim 8 (and Claims 9-12 dependent therefrom) is also patentable over Mackintosh in view of Song.


Application No. 10/563,315
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2009

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998

I:\ATTY\ET\277510US\277510US-AMD4.26.09.DOC